NWX-OS-OGC-RKVL

Moderator: Amy Margolis
April 3, 2013
12:00 pm CT

Coordinator: I'd like to thank all participants for holding. All lines will be on listen-only until the question and answer portion of today's conference. I'd also like to inform participants today's call is being recorded. I'd now like to turn the call over to Tara Rice. Thank you. You may begin.

Tara Rice: Good afternoon everyone. Thank you for joining us for today's Webinar on completing your continuation application.

This is Tara Rice and I hope that you will find the information helpful and that many of your questions will be answered.

If you have additional questions after today please contact your project officer or your grants management specialist for additional guidance.

This Webinar will be recorded and archived for your future reference.

By now you should've all received the 2013 continuous application guidance. If you have not received this information you can also find it on grand solutions. And if you can't find it there please let your project officer know.

We'll start today's call by reviewing application submission requirements, project report and work plan submission requirements, briefly overviewing performance measure requirements and discussing the budget and required forms. We'll then allow time for questions and answers.

After the Q&A period we will then excuse all of the TPP Pier 1 AB grantees who are not conducting a rigorous grantee level evaluation. And then we'll conclude the Webinar by having Mathematica Policy Research review the evaluation reporting requirements for all TPP grantees conducting a rigorous evaluation.

The purpose of the continuation application is to report on your progress of the project for this current budget year and also provide a work plan, detailed budget and budget narrative for the upcoming year.

The 2013 continuation application guidance provides detailed information on the application submission process and the required content for the application.

The guidance also includes example templates for the progress report work plan evaluation reports and as well as examples of partially completed reports.

The guidance also includes a checklist of information that should be included in each of these pieces of the application.

Please be sure to refer to the current year's guidance as you complete your application as there may be small changes from year to year.

Now I will turn this over to Cassandra Chess who will present on submitting the application and content of the progress report and work plan. Cassandra?

Cassandra Chess: Thank you Tara. Good afternoon everyone. As Tara said I'll be talking about the submission process for your application.

In addition to sending out the guidance document for completing the noncompeting continuation application OAH emailed a grantee manual that includes helpful tips for submitting the application on grant solutions.

Allow yourself plenty of time to submit your application by the deadline. Be prepared for any unforeseen challenges and submit early.

Contact the grant solutions helpdesk at the number or email that you see at the end of the slide with any questions.

Now the next few slides will discuss content that should be included in the continuing continuation application, progress report and work plan.

The information on the slide is a required content for the continuation application. Information on the performance measure report budget and evaluation progress report will discussed - be discussed later in the Webinar.

No specific (lent) is required for the six month progress report. Progress reports are evaluated on the basis of substance not length.

Provide a supporting document in the appendices if they add clarity or depth to the narrative. A pendency should add value or clarity to the information presented in the application. Extensive appendices are not required.

The expectations for the progress report is a description of objectives and activities for the first six months of the current budget period which cover September 1, 2012 through February 29, 2013.

Your introduction should briefly restate the purpose of your grant. Goals and objectives, you will include a thorough description of the status of all objectives and activities to support the grant program. If applicable include reasons that goals and objectives were not met and a discussion of assistance if any needed to resolve the situation.

Describe major accomplishments. Include sufficient detail that anyone picking up the report could understand what you have been doing and what has been accomplished. Whenever possible include statements that include the outcome of your actions.

For the narrative include sufficient detail in the narrative description. Anyone picking up the report should be able to understand what you've been doing and what has been accomplished.

Challenges and barriers, describe any challenges and barriers you encountered and how they were addressed. And also report on other project activities.

Any significant project activities, accomplishments, setbacks or modifications, for example a change in key staff or change in scope of work that have occurred in the current budget period and were not a part -not part of the program work plan. These should include legislative and/or judicial actions impacting the program as well as agency events.

There are some tools included in the guidance, progress report tools and resources. There is a progress report template. However the recommended

template is not required. The requirement is to read all of the outlined expectations.

You also have a checklist that includes a list of key information to include in the progress report.

Here is an example of the six month progress report which is available in your continuation application guidance.

Now your work plan should provide information on of objectives and activities for the upcoming budget year which would cover September 1, 2013 through August 31, 2014.

You work plan should describe the goals, objectives which should be described in the smart format, activities, your timeline, persons responsible for each activity and the measure of effectiveness for each objective.

The work plan should include sufficient details to provide a clear picture of the program and activities for the upcoming year.

Expectations of the work plan, the work plan is intended to be an ongoing monitoring and evaluation tool for you and OAH. The work plan should be a document that is used and continually updated based on new information.

For the purposes of a continuation application please complete the work plan for the upcoming budget year with the information you currently have.

The template provided which is a suggested format, not required however. It is to ensure that the work plan is detailed and complete.

Tools and resources related to the work plan, there are two work plan templates. And an example of a partially completed work plan and a work plan checklist that includes a key information to include in the work plan. And all of these are in your continuation application guidance.

And this is - slide is an example of a work plan.

Please note beginning in year four grantee progress reports and performance measure data will be due 30 days after the end of the reporting period.

The six month progress report and performance measure data will be due on March 29, 2014 and the 12 month progress report and performance measure data will be due on September 30, 2014.

The year five continuation application will continue to be due on May 31, 2014.

Prior to the dates OAH will provide grantees with guidance prior to each reporting date.

Now I will turn it over to grants management. Oh I'm sorry back over to Tara Rice to talk about the TPP performance measure report.

Tara Rice: Thank you Cassandra. This is just going to be a very brief overview of the TPP performance measures requirement.

You have two options for you to submit your TPP performance measures to OAH online through the Website that is listed on the slide. You can either input information directly into the Web system through Option 1 or you can upload spreadsheets using predefined templates which is Option 2.

The measures that we're collecting are of two types. Everyone is expected to report grantee level measures on program structure. These include reach which is calculated from your participant demographic information, dosage which is calculated from your participant attendance data, fidelity which comes from the facilitator logs and observation of at least 10% of sessions.

All grantees will also be expected to enter information about their partners, their facilitator trainings and their dissemination activities directly into the Web site.

If you have a rigorous evaluation specifically to your Web CDs tier two and federal evaluation participants your evaluator should also be submitting participant level information from the baseline and posttest surveys for all control and intervention use that have parental permission to be in the study.

For more detailed information regarding specifics of data entry please see the performance measures Web site user manual which was recently uploaded, updated and uploaded onto the system today. And those of you who are users of the Web site should have received a blast email indicating that the user manual has been updated.

There's been a lot of changes to it including it now includes some screenshots and more FAQs. So I think it'll be a useful reference for you to check out.

Additionally the Webinars on using performance measures Website are archived on both the OAH Website as well as the performance measures Website.

If you have specific technical assistance questions about uploading your data please contact the RTI performance measures help desk using the helpdesk feature on the Web site.

And just a reminder that all data must be uploaded by May 31 of this year. The May 31 report should include your data from September 1, 2012 through February 28, 2013.

And please be sure to enter your data early so that if you have any questions or need technical assistance you allow for sufficient time to get that addressed.

And just a quick note here because we know that some of the tier one AV grantees are also doing evaluations that are non-rigorous that we want to make sure that you're including a little bit of information in your continuation application about the progress of those activities.

If you're an AV grantee and you're conducting an evaluation we'd like to - for you to document your evaluation findings and submit information on the progress of your evaluation in the continuation application.

You can do this either through your work plan or your progress report or include it as a separate brief narrative.

And you can include descriptions of the methods that you're using for collecting data, the incentives that you're providing to students, the output data that you're collecting or the results that you're getting, any data on the quality of services that you received from students surveys or observations of performance that are beyond the OAH performance measure requirements or any recommendations that you might have for adaptation or program changes or and/or conclusions that are coming from your study to date.

And now we will turn over the call to Deborah Hayes and Dixie Perez from the Office of Grants Management who will be reviewing required forms and budget completion with you.

Deborah Hayes: Good afternoon everyone. I hope all - everyone is doing well. My name is Deborah Hayes. I'm with the Grants Management Office. I'm a grants Management Specialist.

And I have also here today it's Dixie Perez. She's also a Grants Management Specialist in the Office of Grants Management. And we'd like to go over the required forms for the budget completion.

I'd like to review the required forms and completion of the budget for submission of the 2013 continuation application. I'll be briefly covering completion of the forms, the budget and the indirect rate agreement.

Woman: Okay.

Deborah Hayes: The following forms are required for the application submission. You need the SF424. You need the SF424A, the SF424B in the SFLLL which is the lobbying activities form.

The SF424 is the application that you mainly fill out that must list the program director and the authorized business official. The SF424 is the budget information sheet which lists only the federal and nonfederal and in-kind or matching contributions.

The 424B is the assurance page which has policies, laws and regulations and then also the disclosure from the lobbying activities.

And if you're not participating in any of the lobbying activities then you still have to fill that form out and put NA of the non-applicable.

After completing all these forms it's important for you to print the signature page only. You sign it and you scan it and you upload it as an attachment in the grant solutions during submission for your grant solutions application.

((Crosstalk))

Deborah Hayes: One your budget sheet on page, the SF24A the page should be completed to list each applicable major budget category similar to the SF424A in which funding is requested.

For each major budget category please list the items within the category and indicate the amounts of money allocated for that line item within the category.

Include a federal amount requested, the matching in-kind contribution, indirect reimbursements and total budget and also include on the equipment line a unit cost of $5000 or more.

If less than $5000 please remove that from the equipment to the supplies category.

The budget narrative justification must explain in detail and justify the federal and nonfederal expenditures by object class categories as listed on the budget page.

For clarification and simplicity it is best to discuss each expense by object class in order that they appear on the SF424A and the budget page.

Please include all the dollar amounts in the discussion and the explanations of how the dollar amounts were derived. Include detailed descriptions of all justifications, provide any matching or in-kind contributions cost details.

Also if applicable include the indirect reimbursement calls with details as to how the reimbursement amount was determined.

Please list overall total communicative amount of the end of the budget narrative.

Your indirect costs rate agreement, this is required to have a current indirect cost rate agreement or cost allocation plans in place prior to the award.

If the current rate is not on file with the awarding office or expired or will include funds for reimbursement of indirect costs.

However, if the indirect costs portions will remain restricted until a current and approved rate is provided to the Office of Grants Management.

And here's an example of the budget information sheet. First this, you know, this is the SF424A witches a fillable form online in grant solutions. The budget page is for non-construction program.

When completing Section A please enter budgetary data within Column C federal and Column D nonfederal.

In Column E enter E and F only. I'm sorry. Let me make that clear. Please fill out the Column E and F only because this is for the next year either new or revised budget.

The Column C and D is only for unobligated funds or funds that you have to carry over. We're not going by that this time. We just need you to put the dollar amounts in the new or revised budget column federal E and non-federal F.

And when completing Section D which is budget category enter all federal requested budgetary data by using Column 1 showing the various totals requested by the object class category.

And this is the back side or Page 2 of your budget information sheet. Always complete Section C which is the nonfederal in-kind or required matching contribution for your application.

Enter amount based on resources, provide B of the applicant's organization, C state or the D of the sources.

Sections D and F are optional but not required for the submission.

Now we're going to okay, all must - applications much have a budget and itemized budget narrative justification.

These documents must list the federal and if applicable the nonfederal expenditures by object class category. The costs should be out one from top to bottom similar to the submitted SF424A. Please provide a breakdown of all costs that are similar to the example as you see here.

For travel related calls please ensure you provide a brief description of the travel involved and its purpose, provide an explanation on how the proposed travel is necessary for successful completion of the project.

Equipment costs are always for property items with a unit of $5000 or more.

Items that do not meet the equipment definition that are $5000 less you have to move that over to the supply object category under supply yes.

For supplies please be sure you provide a breakdown of supplies by quantity and cost per unit. For contractor treat each contract or sub grant as a separate item and detail the proposed costs.

Describe the products or services to be obtained. Provide a separate budget for each sub grant or contract regardless of the dollar amount.

And for the object category other list items by type of material or nature of expense not eligible for listing under the above categories.

Include a land item showing the total direct costs for federal, if applicable a separate line showing the total nonfederal like for example the in-kind or requiring matching as shown here.

If applicable list the current approved indirect cost rate percentage and amount for reimbursement. You must have a current indirect cost rate agreement or a cost allocation plan. If not it will include a restriction for usage until a current and approved agreement is provide into the grant management office.

Finally enter a grand total line as shown listing the total federal and nonfederal support for year four.

And once again just as a reminder the required grant forms you should - would be the SF424 which is the application for federal assistance, the SF424A which is the budget information form.

Then you have the SF424B, the assurance which has all the policies and laws and regulations on it. And last but not least the SFLL which is the disclosure of lobbying activities report to disclose lobbying activities.

And if you're not having any lobbying activities please fill out and then put NA for non-applicable. And this is - we're open for any questions at this time.

Coordinator: Okay. At this time if you'd like to ask a question press Star 1 on your touch-tone phone. Once again that Star 1 to ask a question.

Tara Rice: While we're waiting we also got a couple of questions. We got a couple of questions through - we got a couple of questions here online.

Someone asked about whether the presentation and a recording will be made available later. And yes this recording - this is being recorded and the archives will be - it will be archived on our Web site at a later date.

Looks like we also got a grants related question for the SF24A unobligated funds from year two or year three.

Woman: It would be three.

Woman: Year three.

Do we have any questions on the telephone?

Coordinator: We do have one. And before I take it once again Star 1 for questions and (Camille) your line is open.

(Camille): Thank you. I have a question regarding the work plan. In the guidance it says that the work plan needs to cover the goals and objectives for the entire grant but also needs to be specific for the activity for the next fiscal year which will be four, fiscal year four.

My question is because in the past we have actually with the technical review when we have submitted a work plan that includes the goals as they are for the entire grant.

But then when we, you know, reported what the activities we plan to do in relation to those goals and activities for year four then its come back and said that we needed to report just on year four and not the entire grant.

So I just want some clarification in the work plan of what exactly needs to be included in that just for clarification. Thank you.

Coordinator: Okay next question's from (Lori). Your line is open.

Woman: Wait.

Coordinator: Sorry about that.

Woman: No problem.

Coordinator: One moment. Let me get (Camille) back.

Deborah Hayes: The goals are five year, are five year goals. And the objectives are for year to year, will before year four.

(Camille): Okay thank you.

Deborah Hayes: You're welcome.

Coordinator: Okay now we'll go with (Lori). Your line is open.

(Lori): Hi. Going back to the question about the carryover funds on Page 27 of the presentation regarding the SF424A it says no unobligated carryover funds.

Well unless we have a crystal ball we won't know what those funds are from year three. So would that be carryover funds for your two question mark?

Deborah Hayes: Could you - I'm sorry could you repeat the question again about the unobligated funds, which ones are you talking about? Are you talking about year two or year three?

(Lori): I'm talking about...

Woman: Did we lose her?

Woman: Hello? Are you still there?

Coordinator: Looks like she disconnected. Give me one moment see if I can get her back on.

(Amy Merkel): So I think it sounds like we lost the person answering the question. This is (Amy Merkel). We can follow-up if you send us a specific email.

But just estimating your unobligated funds if you have an estimate if you know you're going to have a lot of funds include that there. If not just leave it off. We handle carryover requests totally separate from the continuation application. So please do not worry about your carryover request at this time with the continuation navigation. That whole process to request carryover funds is totally separate.

Coordinator: Okay. We can move on to the next question then. (Kathy) your line is open.

(Kathy): And my question is related to the 424 document. My understanding is that the application from the 424 form itself once it's signed that it's a surety that you're going to comply with all the regulations.

And if you've already filed all your assurances and certifications do you still have to submit the 424B assurance form?

Deborah Hayes: Yes ma'am.

(Kathy): Okay with its own signature?

Deborah Hayes: Yes. Only the pages that require signature and you have to upload that into grant solutions underneath attachment.

(Kathy): Okay. I just wanted to confirm. That's a little different than some of our other grantors so thank you very much.

Deborah Hayes: You have a good day.

Coordinator: Once again Star 1 for questions. And (Lynn) your line is open.

(Lynn): Yes hello. I don't know if there's a technical difficulty but I can hear any of your answers to the questions.

So I had a question about the unobligated funds for year three if we know whether or not they're going to be available or when we can look to hear back about those because that will have some impact on my report for this year.

Woman: Yes sorry we had - there was some kind of disconnect when you asked the question earlier.

The carryover - request for carryover funds is totally separate from the continuation application. So if you have carryover funds that you are requesting from year to carryover to year three you need to talk to your project officer.

We had done a separate Webinar discussion on carryover request a couple of months ago. It should be up on the OAH Web site. Your project officer can direct you to the information that you need. That process is handled separately.

Any unobligated funds you're estimating for year three, the current year that you're in, if you know those you know, you know, something happened and you're going to have a lot of carryover funds for some whatever reason you can include that in your budget forms when you submit your continuation application.

Otherwise leave that information out. We handle - again, we handle carryover requests totally separate from this. So your continuation application and carryover consider as two separate things.

(Lynn): Okay thank you.

Coordinator: Okay at this time I have no further questions.

Tara Rice: Okay have a couple of the questions that came online. One was a question about repeating the date, the new date moving forward of when future six month progress reports will be due.

And I wanted to confirm that that would be March 29, 2014 would be when that - when the next year six month progress report and performance measure data would be due.

And then (Austin) asked what are the primary differences between this year's and last year's application?

If you arrange - if you're an evaluation grantee there are going to be some differences in your evaluation reporting.

In terms of submission as Deborah mentioned you have to upload your signature form for your required form to Grant Solutions as an appendix.

And in the guidance we're also asking for a little bit more - specific information about some of your goals and objectives and how you're meeting them in terms of like a little more detail in the checklist for the six month progress report. So those are the key differences.

All right then (Michelle) S. asked regarding the RTI upload if we upload CSO classes will those classes be counted as part of the 10% fidelity observation requirement?

And the answer is no. The CSL classes will not be counted in the dosage for part of your fidelity observation requirement (right).

Okay (Don) asks are the requests for carryover for year two still on hold?

We'll let you know when those move forward. Right now they're still on hold.

Okay. So I think that covers our question and answer for this point in time. And we're going to move on to the evaluation piece with Mathematica Policy Research.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Oh there's more? Okay I'm sorry. Okay. I can't see. Where is it?

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Okay. All right yes so someone else has asked (Joy) can you clarify about CSL classes not counting?

CSL classes for our - for the performance measures do not count towards your 10% observation requirement.

(Sarah) asked how do we report on classes that started in the six month period but will not be completed?

There is a tab if you doing the spreadsheets. And if you're doing Option 1 I believe there's also a way that you indicate whether you've completed something or not.

So please refer to the user manual which has been updated to reflect to that information.

If your class has started in the six month period but they won't be repeated by the reporting period then you should mark them as not complete.

If they did get completed during the first six month period please mark them as complete.

Okay so we're done with the questions at this time. If you are a Tier 1AB grantee please disconnect at this point in time. The rest of the presentation is strictly for those grantees who are doing rigorous evaluations and working with evaluation technical assistance from Mathematica.

So at this point I will turn over the Webinar to Mathematica Policy Research. Thank you.

(Jean): Thank you Tara. This is (Jean). I'm with the Evaluation Technical Assistance Team. I'm going to spend a few minutes reviewing the evaluation reporting requirements focusing on a few key elements in the consort diagram and the baseline equivalence tables.

When I'm finished I'll turn things over to (Susan Zee) and (Russell Cole) who will discuss a new aspect of evaluation reporting which is the analysis plan template. Then we'll take any questions that you have at the end.

So essentially we're making the same request for information that we've made in the past asking you to provide sample intake information collected through a consort diagram and baseline equivalence tables.

Most of you have already submitted this information once so you'll simply be updating information that you've already provided to us.

Once we get the data from you we'll review it and provide a written assessment of where the evaluation currently stands with regards to the HHS evidence standards for attrition and equivalents. We'll soon be sending written assessments from our last round of review and we can discuss those investments at our next monthly calls or at the grantee conference so that you're clear on how to use this data to inform your evaluation implementation, data collection and ultimately your analytic plans.

In some cases we've already been discussing these issues with you as they were particularly time sensitive.

We'll also be presenting a session at the grantee conference to give you a better grounding in the evidence standards as your evaluations are maturing and you approach your analysis and report writing.

So I'm not going to spend time reviewing all the components of the consort diagram and based on equivalence tables since most of you are familiar with those and you have been to multiple Webinars discussing those already. Rather I'm going to focus on a few key issues or items that people have had questions about.

First several people have asked whether they should provide data on their evaluation pilot sample. You should not. We only want data on the actual evaluation sample.

Second, please provide us with as much data as you have available. The more recent the data is the more valuable it is for us in diagnosing potential issues and coming up with solutions for you in time to avert a potential issue.

That said we recognize that some of you may need time to complete data entry. So, you know, we don't provide a specific cut-off but we encourage you to aim to provide with us with as much data as you can.

Third, if you've enrolled multiple cohorts or sites please provide us data pooled across those cohorts and across those sites. We're interested in looking at attrition and equivalents of the full sample. So we'll need to see those estimates combined.

However we do encourage you to examine data separately by cohort and by site as well as that can provide useful diagnostic information for you.

Finally we're asking you to provide baseline equivalence data on multiple samples. Some evaluators have not reported on all the samples that we've requested. So we want to make sure that this request is clear to everyone.

At minimum everyone should provide baseline equivalence data for the full sample of youth that has complete a baseline survey.

And then we would also like a baseline equivalence table that corresponds to each of your analytic samples where the sample's completing each of your follow-up data collections. These can all be included in the same workbook. We just ask that you label the table clearly with the sample it represents.

And I'm just going to walk through an example sample evaluation so that it's clear what we're looking for.

So here imagine that we have an evaluation in which 1000 youths were enrolled in two equal cohorts of 500 youths. Nine hundred youths have completed the first follow-up and those were all from the first cohort and they lost about 10% to attrition. Only the - actually sorry, that was both cohorts.

Only the first cohort has been released for the second follow-up and 400 have completed that with about 20% attrition.

So for this evaluation we would expect to see three baseline equivalence tables. The first one would be for all youth with sample size of 1000 minus some item non-response on particular items.

The second one would be for the sample responding to the first follow-up which would be 900 youths minus any item non-response.

And the third table would be for the sample responding to the second follow-up or about an end of about 400 minus item non-response. And again what we're interested here is the baseline means for those youths, not their outcome data.

Okay next I want to review a few things to keep in mind when filling out the consort diagram. First, please document the number of ineligible youths and the reasons that they were ineligible.

In particular if any youths were deemed ineligible after random assignment -- we've been seeing this come up in a few cases -- please provide the reason why they were ineligible along with a breakout of accounts by a treatment and control status.

This will be very important information for reviews of a final report to see that you had clear eligibility rules and that they were applied consistently across condition.

Second, just a reminder that when you're preparing consort diagrams for youths within a clustered RCT please remove all youths from (treating) clusters from the sample.

So for instance, if a whole school dropped out because a principal refused to participate do not reflect those youth on the individual youth consort diagram. We don't want those youth double counted towards attrition. And that'll be reflected in the cost or level attrition.

Finally we have none one new request this round. And that is that as you're filling out the consort boxes for the follow-up surveys we'd like you to them include the number of youths that are eligible for or have been released for that follow-up survey.

So for instance if only one cohort has been released for the long-term follow-up they're the only ones that, you know, for which a year has passed since the program has ended, please include the sample size for cohort one in that box as the eligible sample size.

That way we can assist attrition relative to only the eligible or the released youth at that point.

We've revised the template to request this information and the revised template is on SharePoint and I'll show you a link to that later.

Some of you have already been providing us this information and that's great and you can continue to provide it in the format that you've been giving it to us already.

I also wanted to review a few issues we see on the baseline equivalents reporting. First with regards to race ethnicity if the categories in the Excel template don't reflect how you will report the data you can feel free to revise that characterization to reflect how you'll actually report it.

For instance if almost the entire sample is one race such as African-American and in your final analysis you only expect to have categories of African-American and non-African-American you can adjust the Excel file to reflect that categorization so that one we're assessing baseline equivalence it's true to the expression that you will ultimately have.

Second if you have a clustered randomized control trial the Excel file does not account for the clustering of youths when calculating the statistical significance. And the P values in the worksheet - and then the P values in the worksheet will probably be too small.

We encourage you to calculate your own P values outside of that spreadsheet and then key them in for us in the appropriate column.

Third, we went to examine baseline equivalence of the full sample. So therefore we're requesting that you use logical amputation to obtain measures for the full sample when skip patterns were used to avoid asking questions for which responses were known.

So for example if a respondent indicates that they have not had sex but then leaves the count response blank as they should a logical amputation for the count of sexual experiences would be zero.

Similarly if a respondent indicated they never had sex you can logically impute that their response to having had sex in the past three months to being no.

Having these measures reflect the full sample allows us to examine baseline equivalence of the full sample. And that's probably one of the things that we've seen missing most that people aren't imputing that data so we can't really assess baseline equivalence for the full sample.

Now that said we do expect that there will be some item non-response for these questions as a result of refusals and don't knows.

So therefore it's likely that there will be some variation and across question. This is okay. We're not asking you to impute so that there is one sample size consistent throughout the table. We're only asking you to do logical amputation as appropriate.

And finally we just wanted to give you a reminder of where the templates are located on SharePoint. They're in the Annual Progress Report Requirements under Share Documents.

There's a link there to the new consort diagram. And the name of that file ends in _revised April 2013.

There are two copies of the Excel workbook for baseline equivalents. And you should feel free to contact your TA liaison if you have any questions.

We'll also have time at the end of this presentation if you have any specific questions. And now I'm going to turn it over to (Susan Zee) to talk about the analysis plans.

(Susan Zee): Thank you (Jean). Good afternoon everyone or good morning. I'm going to be discussing a new evaluation reporting requirement that is due with the May 31 continuation application. And that's the analysis reporting template that was included in the materials that OAH distributed to you that are also available on our SharePoint site.

So I'm - myself and (Russell Cole) will be introducing this new template to you. We'll be speaking moving rather quickly over the next 30 minutes or so to get through these expectations allowing about ten to 15 minutes for questions at the end.

But I'll also be pointing to support materials that you can access to answer any additional questions that you may have and also emphasize other areas for your support as you're moving through this process.

So the OAH analysis plan is designed so that there is a consistent approach for addressing policy relevant questions employed across a dozen of independent evaluations that are ongoing.

The plan represents three primary objectives. And we will go into these in greater detail as we move through this presentation. But I'll describe them each briefly now.

The first objective is that there will be an end of grant report that will share the impact of the intervention on behavioral outcomes that are relevant to the HHS evidence review.

That report will also contain all of the information that evidence review will need to assess the quality of the evidence and assign an appropriate rating to the evidence on each presented behavioral outcome.

The second objective of this analysis plan template is that the end of grant report is also intended to be accessible to a policymaking audience, not necessarily other researchers and academics. And therefore the findings should be presented consistently across all of the ongoing evaluations. And the findings should be interpretable to that audience.

For these reasons and as will be discussed more in a bit OAH is asking that means and percentages be reported and for one focal follow-up period at a time.

Finally the analysis plan also reflects emerging best practices for impact estimation including distinguishing between primary and secondary research questions, adjustments for multiple comparisons, appropriate approaches for handling missing data and the importance of sensitivity tests.

So why should you do an analysis plan? Well this is not meant to be facetious despite the fact that this is now a requirement it is really good practice and it only benefits you.

So as we shared with you at last spring's conference you can expect that there will be multiple interest groups that are poised to question the fundings.

The intervention may be the target. For example some groups may have concerns about its content towards delivery approach or its ability to be replicated or because that it already has evidence of effectiveness or because it does not.

But regardless whether that intervention is the target or not it is almost always the evaluation team that comes under fire.

So key questions will be asked of the evaluators in an attempt to discredit the findings.

So now questions about internal validity of the results will be easy to answer we hope with the support we have given you and will continue to give.

But the additional questions that critics are likely to ask include well did the evaluator go fishing for that outcome that had a positive and significant impact, were negative for no findings withheld from the final report?

Were the evaluator's analytic and reporting decisions influenced in any way by knowledge of the findings?

Well advanced analysis planning is a strategy for heading off these consents so most importantly preparing an analysis plan therefore before examining your data and conducting analyses enhances the objectivity in a scientific nature of your approach. And therefore enhances the credibility of your findings.

Because the analysis plan identifies the research question, outcomes and analytical approaches in advance of examining the data everyone will be

better assured that the reported findings are not influenced by knowledge of the outcome.

Second, establishing an analysis plan is an excellent way to gather the buy-in of all of your stakeholders and then in particular the developer of the program staff.

The agreed-upon analysis plan is everyone's roadmap for how the evaluators are going to proceed from data collection to the presentation of the findings.

If everyone agrees on the approach there is little room for debate when the findings emerge.

And finally believe it or not having a plan improve the efficiency of the analyses. Know what you're going to do and how you're going to do it and the plan lays the groundwork for your reporting.

In fact many sections in the analysis plan can be recycled into the reports, journal articles and study abstracts.

So before we really dive in deep for the particulars of the plan I want to provide you with a couple things to keep you afloat. The first is flexibility and the second is support.

So first on flexibility, as we will discuss some aspects of the plan have been predefined. For example OAH is asking that you focus on behavioral outcomes relevant to the evidence review and to present means or percentages for the outcomes collected at a focal follow-up period.

However not all aspects of the plans are straitjackets. Plans change. We all know that from constructing an analysis plans before examining the data kind of like a catch-22. And then we realized that we may not be able to execute some aspects of the plan.

For example you may have a plan for how you're going to construct a measure of sexual risk-taking. But then you realize that one of your intended survey items is completely unreliable after you examine the data.

So you change your construction of the outcome to include more reliable survey item.

The bottom line is that plans may need to change to provide the true story. And when plans need to change it is critical that the evaluation team keeps a record of those changes and the reasons for them. This will be very important to include in your final reporting.

And second, in terms of support we want to remind you of the resources that you have and will soon have to support your analysis planning.

The first is last year's grantee conference slides where we presented many sessions that were designed to just kind of get you thinking about preparing for analysis.

And then out of those presentations are how to come or are coming to evaluation brief.

The first one is on endogenous subgroups. It was released in December and it's on a SharePoint site.

The second one is forthcoming on approaches for handling missing data.

You also have this analysis plan template that was released with your annual reporting requirements and is on our SharePoint site.

You will soon have a frequently asked questions document on analysis planning that goes into greater details than on the template does on specific items and in particular developing your analytic approaches.

And finally you have your TA liaison and the resources of the entire broader evaluation technical assistance team who you can reach as you know over phone, over emails that will all be present at the conference.

Okay so there are four key elements of the OAH analysis plan that we will talk to about today. But there are actually six elements that are in the plan that you receive from OAH.

So the four we will focus on today are the research questions and intended study conditions. I'll briefly describe those. And then I'll turn things over to (Russ Cole) who will describe the study design and analytic approach.

(Russ) will then also briefly touch on the table shells included in the analysis plan template and your list of the additional analyses you may also do for other publications.

So (Russ) will then finally conclude by discussing the process for submitting and reviewing the plans.

So the first step in developing your analysis plan is to refine the questions that will be used to establish intervention effectiveness.

Many evaluation teams and developers have these questions in mind and articulated them in the initial study design plans.

But for the purpose of this analysis plan which will be the final and grant report OAH is asking that you limit these questions to impactful measures of sexual risk behavior or health consequences -- those outcomes that are relevant to the HHS evidence review.

More specifically these outcomes include measures of sexual activity such as sexual initiation, frequency and number of partners, contraceptive use, sexually-transmitted infections, pregnancies and/or birth.

So the first step is to identify which of these outcomes you will used to establish intervention effectiveness.

The chosen outcomes should be linked to your logic model or the theory of change for your intervention.

Next OAH is asking that you distinguish between primary and secondary questions. Think of primary questions as those whose answers will establish the effectiveness of your intervention.

So primary questions should be focused on a specific behavioral outcome or a plural outcome collected at a specific point in time where you think you will find the true impact of the intervention.

Let’s say you’re evaluating a young program for eighth grade youth that focuses on refusal skills and delaying sexual initiation. Your primary research question could be what is the impact of the intervention on sexual initiation

relative to the control group for youth in a normal school health curriculum one year after the end of intervention when the youth are in the spring of ninth grade?

You might not choose to examine this measure of sexual initiation six months after the end of the intervention because maybe the rates of sexual activity are still a little low among the population to test an impact at that time.

Sexual initiation by the end of ninth grade may be jumping quite a bit and that's where you may want to focus your primary research question.

Now primary research questions should be examined for the full sample unless the study is powered to detect impacts for subgroups defined by baseline characteristics such as youth who are virgins of baseline.

Now secondary research questions are also very useful for understanding intervention effectiveness but are perhaps less critical to the success of the intervention as the primary questions are.

Let's take the example from before, this intervention for eighth grade use focusing underlying sexual initiation.

So the primary test was the effectiveness of sexual initiation one year later when the youth are in the spring of ninth grade.

But let's say the intervention also provide some instruction on contraceptive use. You may want to look at a measure of risk such as unprotected sex or the number of sexual partners 12 months after the intervention ends.

If you're not powered to detect impacts among virgins at baseline and therefore they're not part of your primary questions you may want to include this subgroup in your secondary questions, so kind of subgroups that aren't well powered.

Also you may want to examine the same outcomes that you do in your primary question but at different time points.

So using the example from before if you look at sexual initiation 12 months after the end of the intervention as primary you may want to look at sexual initiation six months after the end of the intervention as secondary.

And the reason it's secondary is for the reasons I discussed before. Maybe you really don't expect to see the impact there but you want to report it.

While the primary and secondary research question will focus on outcomes relative to the evidence review that are presented separately for the various follow-up periods we do appreciate that you may want to examine other outcomes such as knowledge and use different analytic approaches such as growth curves. (Russ) is going to talk about this when he discusses Section 6 of the analysis plan.

So the next part of the analysis plan asks you to describe the intended study conditions. The key here is describe the intervention that you intended to study and the count of actual condition that you expected to exist.

The specific aspects that we're asking you to describe are detailed in the analysis plan template.

Please keep two things in mind when crafting this section. Number one, describe what was intended or expected, not what actually happened. This is very important.

In the final report there will be an opportunity to describe what the youth actually received and whether that's different from what was intended or expected.

And second thing to keep in mind is right this as if you are writing to a complete stranger for (a guess) that we the evaluation technical assistance team or OAH know anything about the intervention.

This is important for two reasons. First, more than just your TA liaison will be reviewing the analysis plan.

But second if you write it for an audience that you expect knows nothing about the intended intervention and the counterfactual condition you can much more easily lift that text and place it into a final study report.

Okay I'm going to turn things over to (Russ Cole).

(Russell Cole): Thanks (Susan). So I'm going to talk about the study design at this point.

A description of the study design provides the necessary context to understand the appropriate ways to analyze the data to answer the primary and secondary research questions. And I wanted to take a second to echo something that (Susan) just mentioned about writing for a complete stranger.

While you've been working with a liaison who's very familiar with your design we wanted to let you know that they will not be the only person who will be reading and reviewing your plan.

Part of the review which I'll talk about at the end of this presentation is having an dependent reader who is unfamiliar with your study look at your submission.

And as such it's important to prepare the description of your design for an unfamiliar audience since this is ultimately who your consumer will be when present - when conducting a presentation or in the journal article anyway.

So the start of the design presentation includes a description of how the sample was originally formed. This has previously been provided as the top box in the concert diagrams submitted for annual progress reports.

But a major component of the description of the research design involves the ways that sample members became members of either the intervention or comparison conditions.

This information is critical to describe in detail because the impact analyses should mirror the ways that the - should mirror the ways that the design was ultimately implemented.

One key piece of information to report is whether individuals versus intact clusters, for example schools or clinics were assigned to condition.

The implication for this piece is getting the correct standard errors when estimating treatment and control differences.

A second key piece of a design to report is whether there was any blocking or stratification that occurred prior to random assignment.

So for example we might see that schools are randomly is send to condition within the districts or that youth were randomly assigned to condition separately in each after school implementation site.

Knowing whether there was any stratification has implications for impact analysis since strata should be built into the impact models to mirror the design and potentially for precision gains as well.

In general it's good practice to describe the random assignment procedure to make sure that all key clustering and blocking had been acknowledged.

For example in the context of an individual level RCT it might be the case that a handful of individuals in the study were assigned as a family unit.

Knowing this detail has implications for the ultimate analysis. And therefore articulating the random assignment procedure is necessary for ensuring alignment between the implements of design and the analytic model used to estimate impacts from the design.

The general takeaway plan from the presentation of the study design piece is that it's good practice to be clear about the details used to generate the samples used for impact estimation.

Being clear about the design and making sure that the impact model used for estimation mirrors this design will allow the best information on program effectiveness to emerge from the study.

So the primary and secondary research questions that (Susan) described can only be answered with data collected for measures that aligned with the questions of interest.

And the only way that the collected data can be used to estimate a fair comparison is that the data were collected in a similar manner across treatment and control arms.

As a result it is necessary to describe the ways that the data were collected in particular describing the timing of data collection, the modes of data collection that we used and most importantly the similarities and differences in the data collection procedures across treatment control arms.

In addition it is necessary to describe the outcome measures that will be used to answer these research questions.

In many cases the outcomes will be based off of the direct responses to survey items collected at the focal follow-up data collection point.

We provided table shell one - Table 1 has a shell that could be used to complete this information in the template.

I've included two hypothetical outcomes in this table. One looks at pregnancy as an outcome and as a direct response to one of the performance items. This was item Q2 on the participant level performance measures.

For this hypothetical grantee the focal time point of interest is the six month follow-up assessment used to answer their primary research question.

A second primary outcome measure is a constructed measure of sexual risk. In order to create this outcome evaluation, the team looked at whether the respondent affirmed and engaging in either of two risky sexual behaviors -- sex without a condom or sex without birth control.

We're requesting that you complete Table 1 for all outcomes that are used to answer primary research questions and Table 1A for all outcomes used for secondary research questions.

Describing the way the data are prepared and analyzed is critical to ensure that the estimated impacts are credible and appropriate.

The data preparation requires a series of decisions and assumptions and it's necessary to articulate these decisions and assumptions to your readers so that they can assess whether they are reasonable and appropriate.

In particular we wanted to highlight two key issues of data preparation here, inconsistent responses on missing data.

We might see inconsistent responses within the same survey. For example, a responded indicates they have never had sex and then provides a nonzero count of the number of times that they've had intercourse or it might occur across surveys. The respondent indicates that they are sexually active at baseline and at follow-up indicated that they've never had sex.

Our suggestion is that in cases of missing or inconsistent data first the prevalence of data elements are reported.

Second, a decision rule should be applied to all the inconsistent or missing data such as treating all inconsistent data as missing or conducting an amputation process for all missing data.

This decision rule needs to be implemented across both treatment and control samples and the decision rule needs to be mentioned in our reporting.

As described later we suggest conducting sensitivity tests that estimate impacts according to different approaches used to handle inconsistent or missing data.

A second type of data preparation is logical amputation. And (Jean) discussed this earlier in the annual reporting template.

In some situations we can use information from other items in the survey to logically impute missing responses.

For example if a respondent indicates they have not engaged in sexual activity it would be reasonable to logically impute the accounts of the number of times they had intercourse as zero.

I do want to highlight that we have not feel that it's appropriate to conduct logical amputation when there are inconsistent responses. That is when there are two conflicting responses we cannot know which of the two responses is indeed correct. And therefore we do not suggest using one piece of inconsistent information as trumping the other.

The key component of the analysis plan is an accurate description of the ways that the impact analysis will be conducted to answer the primary research questions.

There are two broad things that I want to cover here. And first I'm going to focus on what we mean by a benchmark approach for the analysis.

The benchmark analysis is the combination of analytic approaches that are deemed most appropriate in the context of a given study.

Findings from the benchmark analysis will be used as the lead story when reporting how the data were prepared, how the analyses were conducted and which results will be presented.

The robustness of the findings to the choices of the approaches used in the benchmark analysis will be assessed with sensitivity test that the benchmark analysis prevents presents the main approach of getting from research questions to research answers.

The second to address is what we mean by the analysis sample that is used to estimate impacts. And we typically define the analysis sample as the sample members who contribute outcome data at the focal follow-up data collection period described in the research question.

In some evaluation designs the sample may involve data pools across multiple cohorts or across multiple study sites.

Importantly this analysis sample includes all individuals who are assigned and observed at the follow-up period regardless of whether or not they participated fully in the program.

According to the intent of treat framework we will analyze all individuals in the analysis sample according to their initially assigned condition regardless of what they ultimately received.

The complete model specifications used to estimate program impact for each primary and secondary research question needs to be provided to ensure that the analyses are appropriate given the research design in the study.

That is we already have a good sense of how the members of the population became members of the sample of interest and how those members of the sample became treatment or control group members.

And now we want to make sure that the model that is used tests for differences and outcomes appropriately aligns with the design mentioned earlier.

There are three things that I want to mention regarding model specification.

First, for individual level designs that look at an outcome at a particular point in time in many cases it would be fine to just do it T test to conduct an and inferential test in the difference of the outcome.

However, as described in the design phase of the study there might be stratification variables that need to be incorporated into the analytic model. And for many evaluations there may be a desire to include baseline covariance in the analysis to improve precision of the impact estimate.

As a result the model specification will probably be some sort of a regression model where the outcome at the focal time period of interest is regressed on

the treatment indicator variable, indicators for blocks or strata and other baseline co-variants that will improve the precision of the estimate.

Importantly in the HHS evidence review in order for a study to receive the highest evidence rating the impact analysis must adjust for any statistically significant differences in baseline characteristics, in particular demographic variables and baseline measurements of the outcome of interest.

We've included Table 2 in the template as a place where you can identify and justify all the co-variants that you plan on using in your impact analyses.

For cluster designs, that is where schools or centers are assigned a condition for example the model most appropriately adjust for the non-independence of observations nested within the clusters used as the unit of assignment.

This might include the use of hierarchical modelers or clustered extended errors at the unit of assignment. And like the individual level model described above these analyses will need to include indicator variables for strata and baseline covariance as needed.

Finally as described in the frequently asked questions document that (Susan) described when dealing with dichotomous outcomes we are suggesting that all grantees use a linear probability model to estimate program impacts.

As communicated in the March 2012 presentation on estimating interpretable and accurate impacts conducting the analysis using a linear probability model will produce treatment effects that can be interpreted at percentage point differences in the prevalence rates of the outcome of interest which is a more interpretable and understandable effect size than an odds ratio typically reported from analyses of these outcome variables.

So at this point in your analysis plan presentation you'll determine an appropriate and consistent way to estimate impacts from your design for each of your primary research questions.

However there is a concern that when conducting multiple hypothesis tests some significant results might be false positives.

Again during the March 2012 conference the TPP eval TA team outlined the importance of conducting multiple comparison adjustments in impact evaluations that exempt several outcomes.

The key issue is that without a multiple comparison adjustment there is an increased likelihood of observing a spurious significant impact.

That is under the classical testing framework we typically have a 5% chance of incorrectly stating that an impact is significant when the true impact of the program is zero. And when we conduct more hypothesis tests to answer all of our primary research questions without a multiple comparison adjustment we increase the likelihood of finding spurious significant results.

We focus on the multiple comparison adjustment for primary research questions because these are the confirmatory tests that will be used to show the impact of the program on behavioral outcomes that are used in the HHS evidence review.

Now there are number of different procedures that exist for conducting a multiple comparison adjustment. And we've outlined two procedures, the (Bonferroni) in the (Benjamini Hochberg) in the frequently asked questions document that (Susan) mentioned earlier.

But there are several other options. And we encourage you to consider all options.

The main takeaway point here is that you will need to conduct a multiple comparison adjustment for a set - for a certain statistical significance for all primary research questions.

And again please see the frequently asked questions document for more information on how to do these adjustments and how to present the results coming out of these types of analyses.

Sensitivity analyses should always be performed to test the robustness of study findings. To conduct impact analyses researchers are required to make decisions about statistical models, estimation methods, the treatment of missing or inconsistent data and so on.

Some of these decisions involve choosing between multiple valid approaches to addressing an issue. While each approach might be valid each approach might also result in slightly different findings.

And thus it's always preferable to assess the sensitivity of impact findings to these methodological choices so that readers can see whether different choices would have led to substantively different findings.

So here's three sensitivity analyses to consider. First estimating impacts with and without baseline co-variants, there's some debate as to whether regression adjustment for baseline covariance is always appropriate in RCTs.

So we recommend estimating impact models both with and without covariance though in most cases the regression is just - the regression adjusted results will be the benchmark or main findings.

Second, estimating impact using different approaches to handling missing data, we suggest assessing the sensitivity of the benchmark impacts to at least one alternative approach to handling missing data perhaps using both an amputation method and a complete case analysis.

Finally we suggest estimating impacts using different approaches for handling inconsistent survey responses. Just like there are multiple ways of handling missing data that there are multiple ways of handling inconsistent data and results should be presented using at least two options.

The broad takeaway here is that it's good practice to show that your results are robust to a variety of defensible analytic decisions and describing those tests upfront is a good way to be thoughtful about this process.

So Section 5 of the analysis plan template provides information about how results can be presented. To facilitate this effort the TPP eval TA team has created a series of table shells that can be used to fully describe the flow of members through the intervention, the way that the observed analysis samples differs from the originally assigned sample, the equivalence of the analytic sample at baseline and ultimately the impact of the program.

But importantly there is no need to enter any information into these tables.

We expect that at this point you will not have your complete samples and therefore these tables would present an incomplete picture.

We've really just included them to illustrate the ways in which this key information can be presented for final reports down the road.

We will provide more detail about completing these table shells in the report preparation stage of the grants. But again at this point there is no need to do anything with table shells three through seven in the template.

In the final section of the analysis plan template -- this is Section 6 -- please mention all additional research questions that you plan to address using data from the evaluation.

These questions may include impacts on non-behavior outcomes such as knowledge or attitudes, exploratory analyses on mediator variables, information on dosage and participation and the relationships between implementation and impacts.

In addition this section can include- this section can include alternate specification used to test impact of the intervention across time points such as growth curve analyses.

We recognize that these types of analyses and research questions are very important and provide answers to questions that may be of greater interest to you and your stakeholders than the point in time intent to treat estimates that are required in this plan and subsequent reports.

But for the sake of having a clearly interpretable impact at a key time point of interest and to maintain a consistent presentation of results across grantees we have limited the focus of our analysis plan questions on this type of research question and analysis.

We at OAH are however interested in learning about the other types of analyses that are going to be conducted which is why we've requested this type of information here.

So in terms of process you have received the analysis plan as part of your continuing application packet. It's OAH's expectation that these plans will be submitted with the continuing application which is due by the end of May.

We've posted the plan to SharePoint as well and we've included the instructions that these plans should be uploaded to your folder with a common naming convention shown here.

Once the analysis plan has been uploaded it will be reviewed by two members of the Evaluation TA team, one of whom will be your liaison since they are so familiar with this project - with your project.

As mentioned earlier the other reviewer will not be familiar with your intervention and design so please be complete in your presentation of all of these pieces of information.

The results of their joint review will be a response letter where we will ask clarifying questions about your plan.

This process will be similar to the initial evaluation plan review where we had multiple rounds of Q&A about your proposed evaluation design.

Once there is a complete understanding of your analysis plan and it is well appropriate and well aligned with your design OAH will formally approve the plan and our task here will be over.

So that's all that I have in terms of the description of the analysis plan template. So I believe that we're ready now to open it up for questions.

Coordinator: Okay once again Star 1 for questions.

(Susan Zee): So one question has come in over the Webinar system. And the question as what if they respondent marks no, they've never had sex.

But then and subsequent questions perhaps they ignore the skip pattern they say yes they did have sex in the last three months and that they had two partners in that time. Should you go back and impute that actually yes they have had sex or should you just follow their first answer of no, never had sex?

This is a common problem. And actually I'm going to take the lead on this and have then (Russ) and (Jean) weight and others who maybe on the line.

Both approaches are okay. You just have to decide on an approach and use it consistently.

Internally here at Mathematica we typically take the first response no, they've never had sex and treat the others as if they've never had sex.

However sometimes we do go back and other people will go back and say actually yes that person has had sex and then keep the rest of the responses.

They can be important - thing here is to have a rule and apply it consistently.

A third approach may be just to drop these cases because they're inconsistent.

(Russell Cole): So I think that that's exactly right. I think that that depends on a lot of different situations.

One is that this probably it's considered to be an inconsistent response. And so one suggested approach would be to say we don't know which of these two responses is actually the true one and we can potentially - and therefore we might want to treat the two responses as missing.

However as (Susan) pointed out it is plausible to treat the data as it is especially if this is the baseline survey administration in RCT.

In such a situation we would expect probably similar proportions of inconsistent responding across the treatment and control groups in the baseline survey administration and therefore including this inconsistent response in the ultimate impact analysis won't be problematic.

However if there is an inconsistent response in a follow-up survey we might want to think a little bit more carefully about that and look in particular at whether or not there's the possibility that the treatment has influenced the probability of responding inconsistently at a follow-up survey event.

(Jean): Right. And that's one of the reasons we recommend the sensitivity analysis to do it multiple ways as well right?

So you might have a logical decision rule and then you may also just code them to missing say you know what, I don't know which one of these to believe. I'll code the response to missing and I'll estimate my impacts both ways to see if it matters and that affects my final results.

(Susan Zee): A lot of what we've been working with you so far in terms of your baseline equivalence tables has been dealing with this data at baseline before the intervention could have an opportunity to influence it just has (Russ) had said.

So but when you're thinking about the same measures as outcomes then that's where the approach may need to shift. And so I think that may be an important distinction for people who may seem a bit confused about the - this advice now in terms of your analysis plan for outcomes as opposed to how you been coding baseline data that where there may be some inconsistent responses.

There are no other questions that I believe of come in through the Webinar. So if there are questions on the line we could take them at this time.

Coordinator: I have no questions on the phone lines either.

Tara Rice: All right, thank you everybody for your time today. I hope this was useful information for you. This concludes our Webinar. Please disconnect at this time.

Coordinator: Thank you.

(Russell Cole): Bye.

Woman: Bye.

Woman: Bye. Thanks.

END